

REPLY UNDER 37 CFR – 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE TECHNOLOGY

OK TO ENTER: /AC/

CENTER 1794

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit	: 1794	Customer No.	035811
Examiner	: Alicia Anne Chevalier		
Serial No.	: 10/509,269	Docket No.:	TOR-04-1238
Filed	: September 27, 2004		
Inventors	: Mahito Kawano	Confirmation No.:	5364
	: Kiyoshige Maeda		
Title	: LAMINATED FILM,		
	: FILTER FOR DISPLAY,		
	: AND DISPLAY		

Dated: November 13, 2009

RESPONSE**Mail Stop AF**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is submitted in response to the Official Action dated September 17, 2009.

Claims 1-6 and 11-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over the hypothetical combination of Murata and Yamada with Oka. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments hypothetically applying the combination against those claims. The Applicants nonetheless respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not make the hypothetical combination, but in any event, the hypothetical combination would still result in a different multi-layer film from what the Applicants claim. Details are set forth below.

The Applicants will address these details in two portions, namely a portion directed to the "Answers to Applicants' Arguments" section of the Official Action and toward problems with the combination of Oka and Murata, and the combination of Oka and Yamada.

Turning first to the "Answers" section, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Applicants' claimed average surface roughness Ra of 0.004 to 0.020 μm is anything but obvious